

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,260	06/15/2004	Paul Beardow	22557-3013/US	9345
34205 7590 07/25/2007 OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP 45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET, SUITE 3300			EXAMINER	
			AMIN, JWALANT B	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/500,260	BEARDOW, PAUL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jwalant Amin	2628				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period with the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communications ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
<u> </u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2007.					
<i>,</i> —						
•—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
·	and any of the control of					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 139-191 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 139-191 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage				
Attachment(c)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date				

Art Unit: 2628

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 139-191 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 2. Regarding claims 139-191, the applicant argues "... none of the documents cited by the examiner suggests specifying an animation property for the image" (see applicant's remark on page 11 paragraph 4 et al.).

However, the examiner interprets that Strandberg teaches the above limitation.

Please refer to the rejection of claims 139 and 140 for further details.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 139, 140, 147/139, 147/140, 149, 150, 155/149, 155/150, 157, 158, 163/157, 163/158, 166, 167, 172/166, 172/167, 175, 176, 181/175, 181/176, 184, 185, 190/184 and 190/185 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Strandberg (US 6,054,999).
- 5. Regarding claims 139, 149, 157, 166, 175 and 184 Strandberg teaches a method and an apparatus (col. 2 lines 66-67, col. 3 lines 1 and lines 33-37) for transmitting, receiving and generating an animated image (animated cartoon film); said method

Art Unit: 2628

comprising the steps of selecting a set of part images form among a plurality of part images (obtain correct part images from the data base memory 7, figs. 1-3, col. 3 lines 59-67, col. 4 lines 1-4, col. 8 lines 18-20, col. 10 lines 5-11 and lines 36-41); specifying a position, to be occupied in the display, for each part image in said set of part images (upper arm is positioned in the image such that the point M2 on the torso and the point M2 on the upper arm will overlap with one another, figs. 1-3, figs. 7-8, col. 10 lines 5-41 and lines 64-67, col. 11 lines 1-3, col. 13 lines 12-15; figs. 1 and 7 show the part images obtained from the database are placed at the position corresponding to the actor's part position; fig. 8 shows a cartoon figure with mutually different arm positions); specifying an animation property for at least one part image in said set of images (the movement of various part of an actor's body controls the movement of each corresponding part of the cartoon or graphic figure, fig. 8, col. 3 lines 3-66, col. 13 lines 12-15; fig. 8 shows a cartoon figure with mutually different arm positions, but with the remainder of the figure stationary; the different arm positions are obtained as the human actor moves his arm with the remainder of his body stationary); and displaying each part image according to specifications (presents the assemblage on one or more display units).

6. Regarding claims 140, 150, 158, 167, 176 and 185 Strandberg teaches the step of specifying an animation property for each at least one part image in said set of part images comprises the step of specifying at least one of a color (col. 3 lines 59-67, col. 4 lines 1-4, col. 6 lines 27-30); type of movement (the movement of various part of an actor's body controls the movement of each corresponding part of the cartoon figure; fig. 8 shows a cartoon figure with mutually different arm positions, but with the

Art Unit: 2628

remainder of the figure stationary, where the different arm positions are obtained as the human actor moves his arm with the remainder of his body stationary, col. 3 lines 3-66, col. 13 lines 12-15).

7. Regarding claims 147/139, 147/140, 155/149, 155/150, 163/157, 163/158, 172/166, 172/167, 181/175, 181/176, 190/184 and 190/185, Strandberg teaches the step of displaying the image on at least one of a computer (monitor 8, fig. 1, col. 10 lines 36-41; monitor is associated with a computer system), a personal digital assistant, and a mobile telephone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 141/139, 141/140, 142, 143/139, 143/140, 148, 151/149, 151/150, 152, 156, 159/157, 159/158, 160, 164, 165/157,165/158, 168/166, 168/167, 169, 173, 174/166, 174/167, 177/175, 177/176, 178, 182, 183/175, 183/176, 186/184,186/185, 187 and 191, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strandberg, and further in view of Kakiyama et al. (US 5,600,767; hereinafter referred to as Kakiyama).
- 10. Regarding claims 141/139, 141/140, 151/149, 151/150, 159/157, 159/158, 168/166, 168/167, 177/175, 177/176, 186/184 and 186/185, Strandberg teaches the

Art Unit: 2628

step of providing at least one of the selection of the set of part images from among a plurality of part images, the specification of the position to be occupied in the display, and the specification of the animation property for each at least one part in said set of part images (see rejection of claim 139 for details).

Although Strandberg teaches the claimed limitations as stated above, Strandberg does not explicitly teach to provide at least one of the selection or the specification in the form of a text message. However, Kakiyama teaches to a dialogue type image creation device using text messages (figs. 19A-C provides a series of text messages for selecting the desired properties of each part image, and based on the selected property a candidate part image is selected, figs. 19A-C, col. 10 lines 44-48, col. 11 lines 4-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of present invention to select part images using text messages as taught by Kakiyama and apply it into the apparatus of Strandberg because using such a dialogue type image creation system in form of text messages for selecting a candidate part image automatically based on the desired properties results in saving time otherwise required to select the respective part images by operating keys (col. 10 lines 40-47).

- 11. Regarding claims 142, 160, 169, 178 and 187, Strandberg teaches the step of compacting codes used to represent the selections (col. 3 lines 42-45 and col. 4 lines 13-15; a code used to summon the graphic equivalent stored in the computer memory corresponds to code used to represent the selection of part images).
- 12. Regarding claims 143/139, 143/140, 152, 165/157,165/158, 174/166, 174/167, 183/175 and 183/176, although Strandberg teaches the claimed limitations as stated

Art Unit: 2628

above, Strandberg does not explicitly teach the step of receiving the specifications as an appendage to a text message. However, Kakiyama teaches the step of receiving the specifications as an appendage to a text message (figs. 19A-C, col. 11 lines 4-24; the contoured selected in fig. 19 A is appended to the text message for selection of hair style in fig. 19 B; both these selections are appended to the text message as shown in fig. 19 C for selecting eyes, and therefore after all the part images are selected an overall text message combining appended selections is created). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art at the time of present invention to receive specifications for selecting part images using an appendage to text messages as taught by Kakiyama and apply it into the apparatus of Strandberg because using such a dialogue type image creation system that appendages data to the text messages for selecting a candidate part image automatically based on the desired properties selected in earlier steps results in saving time otherwise required to select the respective part images by operating keys (col. 10 lines 40-47 and col. 11 lines 4-12).

- 13. Regarding claims 148, 156, 164, 173, 182, and 191, the statements presented above, with respect to claims 141 and 147/139, are incorporated herein.
- 14. Claims 144/139, 144/140, 145, 146, 153/149, 153/150, 154, 161/157, 161/158, 162, 170/166, 170/167, 171, 179/1751 179/176, 180, 188/184, 188/185 and 189 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strandberg, in view of Kakiyama, and further in view of Haataja (US 6,137,836).

Application/Control Number: 10/500,260 Page 7

Art Unit: 2628

Regarding claims 144/139, 144/140, 145, 146, 153/149, 153/150, 154, 161/157, 15. 161/158, 162, 170/166, 170/167, 171, 179/1751 179/176, 180, 188/184, 188/185 and 189, although the combination of Strandberg and Kakiyama disclose all of the claimed limitations as stated above, they do not explicitly teach the step of obtaining said set of part images from a server in a network, wherein the network comprises a mobile telephone network. However, Haataja teaches a remote station (network) with a computer (server) that transmits composite image of a plurality of primitive pictures (set of part images) to a portable communicator (cellular telephone) (fig. 3, figs. 8-10, col. 6 lines 30-67, col. 7 lines 20-26, col. 8 lines 6-42; the remote station transmitting telephony signals for a cellular telephone corresponds to a mobile telephone network). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of present invention to obtain primitive images from a server in a network as demonstrated by Haataja and use it into the method and apparatus of Strandberg and Kakiyama because obtaining the pictorial data of an image as a set of simplified composite part images of different primitive pictures reduces the required transmission bandwidths and is transmitted rapidly due to relatively few symbols required for transmission of the pictorial data (col. 2 lines 1-14).

Conclusion

- 16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - Shibao (US 7,095,413)

Art Unit: 2628

 Kohno et al. ("Systematic Approach For Creating Animated Character Interfaces")

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jwalant Amin whose telephone number is 571-272-2455. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 9

Application/Control Number: 10/500,260

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*** J.A. 7/17/07

MARK ZIMMERMAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Thank you